## ANNUAL HINGHAM TOWN MEETING

HELD AT:

Hingham High School 17 Union Street Hingham, Massachusetts

DAY 1

Monday, April 25, 2016

To begin: 7:00 p.m.

ARTICLE 19

MAUREEN D. PIRES
VERBATIM COURT REPORTING SERVICES
521 ASHLEY BOULEVARD
NEW BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 02745
(508) 998-5334

and personal property taxes for any fiscal year in which they are serving in a foreign country or act on anything relating thereto.

You will note that the Town approved this exemption under Article Seventeen of the 2012 meeting, but that authorization has expired. The purpose of the recommended motion under Article Eighteen is to extend the authorization for an additional two years.

The recommended motion of the Advisory

Committee which comes unanimously from that

Committee, as well as from the Selectmen is that

the recommended motion be adopted.

Is there discussion?

(No response)

MODERATOR: If not, we come to vote on the recommended motion of the Advisory Committee under Article Eighteen.

All those in favor, please say aye. (Verbal response)

MODERATOR: All those opposed, no. (No response)

MODERATOR: It's a unanimous vote.

Article Nineteen. Article Nineteen

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

asks, will the Town raise and appropriate, borrow or transfer from available funds, a sum of money to be used by the Board of Selectmen for professional services, fees and costs to acquire to continue its investigation into the feasibility of the acquisition of the corporate property and all rights and privileges, including the assets of the Town's water company now known as Aquarion Water Company of Massachusetts and/or affiliated related companies, including Aquarion Water Capital of Massachusetts, pursuant to Statute 1879, Chapter 139, or through any other method of acquisition, including negotiation or litigation, including the currently pending Suffolk Superior Court case or any appeal thereof.

The Board of Selectmen may determine it to be necessary or advisable in order to determine whether the acquisition is feasible and advisable for further Town Meeting consideration or act on anything relative thereto.

This requires a majority vote for its adoption. Your Advisory Committee recommendation is set forth in your Warrant booklet.

Is there discussion?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## Mrs. Power?

MRS. POWER: Good evening. Mary Power, 1 King Philip Path, speaking for the Board of Selectmen.

Article Nineteen requests \$300,000 to conclude the litigation that will determine a purchase price for the water company. request is triggered by the need to address any appeal of the November court ruling and the judgment we are currently awaiting. Aquarion has already stated their intent to appeal the court's ruling.

While you're not being asked tonight whether to purchase the water company, it bears mentioning why we, as a town, undertook this effort in the first place. While the water company has always been a privately owned water company it always gave -- for a long time.

Things started to change in 2002 when Mass. American Water Company sold to Kelda, a British company, who made us part of their Aquarion subsidiary. After five years, in 2007, Kelda sold Aquarion to Macquarie Utilities, Inc., an entity affiliated with an Australian bank.

In 2012, our water rates were the fifth highest in the state. Filings indicated Aquarion's attempt to request rate increases every three years.

We were also concerned about our water infrastructure, based on resident complaints and unaccounted for water -- which is water that is withdrawn from the aquifer, treated, and lost before it gets to our homes -- was sixteen percent. That's six points higher than the DEP standard.

At that time, Hingham was in a small minority of Massachusetts communities with a privately owned water company. Inspectors, combined with our experience with Highham Light, made us question whether to consider purchasing the water company, which is our right under a 1879 statute.

The 2012 Annual Town Meeting authorized a feasibility study. A Study Committee that included four former Advisory Committee Chairs was established. Their work included gathering fifty-seven documents and over three thousand pages of information that is available on the Committee's

web page.

The Committee and its hired experts valued the water system between fifty and sixty million dollars. They identified significant cost elimination opportunities. Initial governance and engineering work was completed.

Since the Town and Aquarion could not agree on a purchase price, as defined by the statute, Hingham filed a Complaint in July of 2013. To limit unnecessary expenditures of time and money, the Selectmen decided to pause with governance and engineering work until the Town knew that it had a viable purchase price.

The trial took place nineteen months after the Complaint was filed, which the litigators tell us is quick for a case of this complexity. Closing arguments took place in May of 2015.

This past November, the Court issued a thirty-two page memorandum containing rulings on four specific questions. We think the Court ruled in Hingham's favor on all four questions.

The Court also required the parties to calculate the final price differently than

originally proposed by either side. Hingham's purchase price submission, which is based on the Court's ruling, remains in the fifty to sixty million dollar range.

Aquarion submitted two prices, one hundred forty-four million, and ninety-six million dollars. Aquarion's submission also stated an attempt to appeal the Court's ruling. An appeal is a review of the existing trial record. It's not another trial, so it will not be as costly as the trial.

So, why approve Article Nineteen tonight? Well, the reason is, the facts. The facts continue to compel us to finish what we started. The Water Company Acquisition Study, the Board of Selectmen, and the Advisory Committee have each spent a great deal of time following this process and analyzing each development. They all agree we should continue.

In fact, there hasn't been a single no vote from any Advisory Committee member or Board of Selectmen in four years, and both boards have turned over many of its members.

Over the past four years, the Town has

spent close to \$1.2 million, primarily for litigation. During that time, Aquarion has reduced our rates twice, resulting in over 3.5 million in ratepayer savings. I don't think that's a coincidence.

The unaccounted-for water story is not as strong. It's grown from sixteen to twenty-three percent in four years which, in 2014, represented over two-hundred and seventy-two million gallons of water. The slide puts those numbers into perspective. Remember them when you see a notice about water restrictions.

At the conclusion of this litigation, if the purchase price is viable for the Town, we will resume engineering and governance work, using town volunteers and paid experts as needed. We don't expect it to take as long or cost as much as the litigation.

In summary, since the Water Company was established in 1879, Hingham has discussed the possibility of Town ownership at least seven times that we've been able to identify, and in each case, a legally binding purchase price wasn't secured, so each subsequent analysis had to start

from scratch.

Article Nineteen allows Hingham to obtain a legally binding purchase price that we as a town can carry into the future. The Board of Selectmen ask for your support of Article Nineteen. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Mr. Taylor, for the Advisory Committee.

MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. Jim Taylor,

3 Grist Mill Lane, speaking on behalf of the

Advisory Committee.

As Selectman Power indicated, Article
Nineteen is not a referendum for the purchase of
the water company. It's an article to appropriate
up to \$300,000 to complete the legal phase of the
Water Company Acquisition Study.

The Advisory Committee voted unanimously in support of this article. It's interesting to note that the Advisory Committee has currently voted on water company funding requests six times over the last four years. As you heard, in each case, after discussion and deliberation, the Committee voted to support each expenditure request each time the Committee analyzed the

rationale behind those requests. And I thought it would be helpful to share the Committee's current analysis with you tonight.

The first item we've taken into consideration is the financial implication of the potential acquisition. We looked at the potential costs, as well as the financing aspect of a purchase.

The Water Company Acquisition Study

Committee built a very detailed spreadsheet,

looking at all of Aquarion's current expenses and

identifying those that would be eliminated under

Town ownership -- considered that under Town

ownership expenses like the profit that Aquarion

earns, rent that it pays itself for the water

treatment plant, corporate office overhead, and

legal expenses incurred in other communities would

be eliminated.

In total, those eliminated costs enable an annual savings of \$2.6 to \$3.2 million dollars per year, amounting to really significant savings over twenty years, at which point, the Town would fully own the Water Company, only compounding the savings beyond that time.

The model includes a significant increase in capital expenses to fund infrastructure improvements. It pays back the Town for all of its expenses incurred in this study process, including all legal expenses, as well as making an annual payment to the Town in lieu of taxes.

Of course, this is predicated on the Court's ruling in favor of the Town's price calculation, which can only be finalized with the continued funding of its legal case.

Committee is the state of repair of the current system. In 2011, Aquarion funded a significant study to identify and prioritize the current status of the water storage and distribution system, and it prioritizes necessary improvements. The study identified over seventeen million dollars in needed upgrades. Compare that with Aquarion's capital investment of around a million dollars at the time of the study, and you see the issue the Town is faced with. Delayed upgrades and repairs result in greater long-term costs to ratepayers, not to mention to capital needs.

But here is the really important thing to remember. It doesn't matter who owns the Water Company. Aquarion ultimately doesn't pay for these repairs, and neither would the Town. It's the ratepayer who pays for all the work. It's you and I.

The current condition of the pipes is effectively irrelevant, as you and I will have to pay for infrastructure upgrade and repairs regardless of who owns the Water Company.

The Advisory Committee is convinced that Town ownership would take a much more proactive approach to fixing the infrastructure. In fact, the financial model I've previously referred to equals five million dollars in year one infrastructure improvements, with an annual ongoing investment of two million dollars.

This proactive approach is more cost effective and much more advisable than to wait for it to break and then repair it, which is what seems to be followed by Aquarion.

Lastly, a very important issue that the Advisory Committee considered and discussed is a continuity of ownership. Aquarion ownership is

complicated and confusing. Aquarion's corporate offices are based in Connecticut, and it appears it is ultimately owned by a private equity fund managed by Macquarie, an investment bank based in Australia.

And a few years ago, forty-five percent of this fund was actually sold to a Canadian Pension Fund.

That's right. The company that delivers our most important scarce resource is owned by a fund that was established for one reason only, to deliver profits to its shareholders.

The Advisory Committee is extremely concerned that at some point in the near future, Aquarion will be sold once again, and sold to another entity, even more motivated by profits.

Selectman Power tried showing Aquarion's requests for over forty-five percent in rate increases in the five years following its acquisition by Macquarie is telling. Town ownership eliminates this concern. We would rather have our elected officials respond to water related issues than having to worry about who the decision makers are when real local problems

occur.

Meeting vote.

If the price does not make sense, then we walk away. We don't spend the \$300,000, and we have a price that future generations could use as a starting point.

We can't secure a legally binding price, though, without finishing what we started. Don't let \$1.2 million dollars be wasted. Let's build on the progress achieved and the over three million dollars of savings realized to date.

Please join me and the other members of the Advisory Committee in voting in favor of this article. Thank you.

MR. STATHOPOULOS: Peter Stathopoulos, 17 Volusia Road.

What disturbs me about the sole

acquisition study is that virtually every single meeting of the Committee has been in executive session, and they mention proprietary information, litigation, et cetera. The minutes should be released now. We've gone to court. I don't see why we have to go to an executive session every single meeting.

Second is that you talked about the elected officials ruling the company -- I could just say Flint, Michigan. So, it's just -- I mean there's sixty-eight million dollar savings over twenty years. What is it currently at, you know, whatever we're borrowing at.

Second is that Aquarion -- responded to the question that we forced them to reduce rates. We did not force them. And I understand that nobody has answered this is -- if it is run by the Town, the rates do not have to go in front of the State Department of Utilities for approval. We can do it on our on.

Second is, one of the things that disturbs me, in plenty of areas of the Town, there's a lack of operational audits. We don't have independent audits done in so many areas of

the Town, and this is one area I would like to see it.

Well, that was probably six years ago the first time I heard it. Is it still the fifth highest rate? I don't know. The problem is that I see these approvals; I see some figures thrown out, but there is no detailed analysis; no support for the figures. Were there RFQs or RFPs put out for any consultants that we are using?

You know, do we have the best thing, or are we just giving friends contracts, which -- you know, it concerns me. And we don't have an independent audit within this Town -- operations audit. We have financial audits, which is fine and it's necessary.

So, there's just -- one, I would like to see all the minutes released that were in executive session. Why should they be held secret, even to now, because at the point of litigation we're at, I don't think there's anything lost if we release it.

And you know, that's it. I mean, I would like to see it discounted. The sixty-eight

million dollars sounds big, but is that ten dollars per household per year, or you know, I'm being absurd, but there's no breakdown; there's no discounted cash flow. And if it's fifty-eight million, does that mean that eight million, we walked away from it or what? You don't have a break-even point showing when we walk away from it.

So, that's -- I hesitate to approve the money for something that the details do not yet released. Thank you.

MODERATOR: Mrs. Power, would you like to respond?

MRS. POWER: Thank you. I'll try briefly to respond to as many of the questions as we were able to record.

First of all, Hingham's water rates were the fifth highest in the state in 2012, when the study was commenced. Based on the last information we have from Tighe and Bond, which is two years ago, our water rates are the tenth highest. There are three hundred and fifty-one communities in the Commonwealth.

With respect to a discount rate, the

discount rate that was used in the model, or the borrowing rate for the Town, was in the three and a half percent range.

With respect to the costs themselves,
Aquarion annual costs are about twelve million
dollars a year. Our analysis indicates that 6.7
million of those costs can be eliminated. So,
that's a little bit over half of those costs can
be eliminated.

And it's important to note that the proposition, at this point, is that that money can get reinvested in terms of improving the infrastructure. And the proposition would be that those savings would allow for fewer and less frequent rate increases than, I believe, the forty-five percent that Mr. Taylor addressed.

With respect to executive session and the release of minutes, the open meeting law is very clear in this area. The open meeting law states that executive session minutes are not to be released until a matter is concluded. And we are still in pending litigation, and that matter is not concluded. So, it would not be in the Town's best interest to release those minutes.

But on the issue of transparency, I
think it's also important to point out that in the
last four years, there have been twenty-four
public meetings where business has been conducted,
where updates have happened; that's a combination
of Town forums, meetings of the Committee.

Just, in fact, since February, the Board of Selectmen have had three televised meetings on Article Nineteen. The Advisory Committee has held two public hearings on Article Nineteen. I think we've had a total of about eight questions.

And lastly, with respect to the

Department of Public Utilities, they aren't the

rate setting agency for public utilities. I went

to a DPU hearing once, and I think others in the

room have been to those. And my impression is -
my experience was, from attending that rate

setting hearing, that the tendency is to favor the

business and the business's rate increase.

If you look back in Hingham's history, the Department of Public Utilities typically awards about seventy percent of a proposed rate increase.

MODERATOR: Your time has expired.

MRS. POWERS: Thank you.

MODERATOR: Is there a further debate or discussion?

Yes? You can come right here, if you wish and speak directly into the mike, please.

MS. CUTLER: Ilona Cutler, 86 Central Street.

I am concerned about this article also. When the public was invited by Aquarion to go down to the water treatment plant, I went down because I'm very interested in water. I feel that one of the most precious commodities a town can have. We don't know how valuable our water is. Take a look at Flint, Michigan.

Well, Aquarion seemed very reasonable to me. I did try to get some facts from them, and they did say the Town does own the water. They do not have to go in front of the DPU, as that gentleman had said. So, the Town has a lot of infrastructure costs, and if they have to do it at the prevailing rates, that's going to be very, very costly to the Town and the water rates can skyrocket.

I would like to see this -- I'd like to

ask if we have any idea how long the litigation is going to go on, because according to this article in the Patriot Ledger -- there's an article about the Hingham Aquarion dispute over the purchase could last years.

So, we're asked tonight to approve three hundred thousand dollars for legal costs. I understand that the Town put a lot of work and effort into the study, and the lawyers got quite a bit of money out of this.

And it's sounds to me like they're going to get quite a bit more money. So, we're going to be asked for three hundred thousand tonight. How much more are we going to be asked for in the future when this is tied up in litigation and not resolved? Thank you.

MODERATOR: Is there further discussion on the recommended motion under Article Nineteen? (No response)

MODERATOR: If not, we come to vote on that. It requires for its adoption a simple majority.

All those in favor of the recommended motion of Advisory under Article Nineteen, please

\_\_\_

1	say aye.
2	(Verbal response)
3	MODERATOR: All those opposed, no.
4	(Verbal response)
5	MODERATOR: It is a majority vote.
6	MR. SIEGFRIED: Mr. Moderator, I vote
7	for reconsideration.
8	MODERATOR: A motion has been made for
9	reconsideration.
10	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seconded.
11	MODERATOR: And seconded. Is there a
12	debate on Mr. Siegfried's motion for
13	reconsideration?
14	(No response)
15	MODERATOR: If you would like to
16	reconsider the matter that we have just voted, you
17	will vote in favor of reconsideration.
18	If you do not want to reconsider the
19	matter that we have just voted, you will vote
20	against reconsideration.
21	All those in favor of reconsidering the
22	action just taken on Article Nineteen, please say
23	aye.
24	(No response)

MODERATOR: All those opposed, no. (Verbal response)

MODERATOR: It's a unanimous vote against reconsideration. The matter may not be reconsidered again.

We now come to Article Twenty. Article Twenty asks, will the Town raise and appropriate, borrow, or transfer from available funds, a sum of money to be expended under the direction of the Board of Selectmen, for the purpose of improving and resurfacing various roads within the Town.

You'll see the comment speaks to a request to authorize two million, two hundred forty-two thousand (\$2,242,000) in funding to accelerate the Town's road building plan.

This requires for its adoption a twothirds vote because it involves borrowing.

The recommended motion of the Advisory

Committee is set forth at page thirty-six. It

says, as follows, Recommended that the Town

appropriate two million, two hundred forty-two

thousand (\$2,242,000) to be expended under the

direction of the Board of Selectmen for the

purpose of improving and resurfacing various roads